

The

REF

"ASS

PRINT

LABOUR'S POLITICAL ECONOMY;

OR THE

Tariff Question Considered

BY HORACE GREELEY.

TO WHICH IS ADDED THE

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF DELEGATES,

Held in Toronto on the 14th April, 1858.

PUBLISHED BY THE

"ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CANADIAN INDUSTRY."

Toronto:

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF "THE CANADIAN MERCHANTS' MAGAZINE."

1858.

The
the prin
in this
among
thereby
market
a distan
the farr
increas
or adva
position
Canadian
mechan
duty of
extent
The r
Canada

L

A
raisin
Indin
sorte
of th
diffic
Impo
In ei
Taxe
exce
effec
repe
unde
then
Now
direc
been
his p

1858
(13)

The following Essay from the pen of Horace Greeley, Esq., expresses, as well as can be expressed, the principles advocated by the "Association for the promotion of Canadian Industry" lately established in this city. The design of this Association is to encourage the growth of manufacturing enterprises amongst us as the best means of securing permanent employment for all classes of our population, and thereby improving not only the general trade of the country, but creating for the farmer a steady home market not only for his wheat, but for those bulky and perishable articles which cannot be carried to a distant market, and for the want of which in the present depressed condition of the grain market, the farmers of Canada are now suffering so severely. The design of the Association is neither to increase taxation nor to foster by protection any branch of trade for which we have no natural facilities or advantages, but only by a discriminating tariff to place the manufacturers of Canada in as good a position as that of other countries with which we trade. In all articles of agriculture, for example, the Canadian farmer is placed on an equal footing with the United States farmer, but not so the Canadian mechanic. On all such manufactures as he could send to the United States, he is shut out by a duty of from 24 to 30 per cent, while we admit the manufactures of the United States to a considerable extent *free of duty*, some at 5 per cent., and the great bulk of their manufactures at 15 per cent.

The result of such a policy has been to drive the mechanics out of the country, and thus lose to Canada all the advantages arising from the expenditure of their earnings amongst us.

LABOUR'S POLITICAL ECONOMY.

THE TARIFF QUESTION.

BY HORACE GREELEY.

1. *Direct and Indirect Taxation.*

ALL Governments require Revenue—ours among the rest. Two modes of raising Revenue are available—1. That of Direct Taxation; 2. That of Indirect or Voluntary Taxation. The Federal Government has twice resorted to Direct Taxation; first under old John Adams in 1798-9, because of the inadequacy of our Revenue from Imports, owing to our portentous difficulties with France; and again under Madison, when our Revenue from Imports was ruined and our Expenditure quadrupled by the War of 1812. In either case, though the necessity was urgent and undeniable, the Direct Taxes were slowly and with difficulty collected at a heavy expense, and were exceedingly unpopular. They contributed signally to the discontent which effected the defeat of Adams and the overthrow of his party. They were repealed as speedily as possible by Jefferson and his supporters, and again under Madison at the first moment that they could be dispensed with. Since then (nearly forty years) no serious effort has been made to re-impose them. Now and then a theorist has dilated on the superior equity of Direct to Indirect Taxation; and once or twice a proposal to re-impose the former has been made in Congress; but the mover always took good care to do it when his party was a minority, and thus shielded from all responsibility. When-

ever it recovered the ascendancy, the proposition to levy Direct Taxes came up missing, and so remained. It may be considered practically settled, therefore, that the Revenue needed to pay the debts and defray the current expenses of the Federal Government will long continue to be raised by Indirect Taxation, and mainly by Duties on Imports, no matter which party may for the time be in power. No party is now committed to or earnestly proposes any other mode; and the plausible suggestion that Direct Taxation, because it bears more palpably on the community, would secure greater economy in the Public Expenditures, is confuted by the fact that the revenues of our great cities, and especially of *this* city, though mainly raised by Direct Taxation, are expended quite as foolishly and wastefully as those of the Federal Government ever have been.

2. The Question Stated.

And now the question arises—On what *principle* shall Duties on Imports be assessed? Since nobody now proposes, or has ever seriously urged, a uniform assessment of so much per cent. on the value of all articles imported since even the present Tariff, framed by the avowed adversaries of Protection, levies one hundred per cent. on certain articles, and thence down to thirty, twenty-five, twenty, fifteen, five, to nothing at all on others, what rule shall govern the discriminations made? What *end* shall they look to? What shall determine whether Tea, for example, shall be placed in the class of Free articles, or subjected to a duty of ten, twenty, or thirty per cent.?

We who stand for Protection meet this question frankly and clearly. We all agree in saying, "Impose *higher* rates of duty on those Foreign Products "which come in competition in our markets with the products of our Home "Industry, with *lower* duties (or none at all, according to the varying wants "of the Treasury,) on those which *do not* thus compete with the products of "our own Labor." Thus Tea and Coffee, now free, have been subjected to duties for Revenue purely, in which case the proper rate is the *lowest* that will afford the needed income. But to a different class of Imports, we would apply a different criterion. If it were demonstrated, for example, that a reduction of the duty on Shirts, Pantaloons, &c., to *five* per cent., would increase the aggregate of Revenue therefrom by transferring to Europe almost the entire manufacture of garments for American wear, we should strenuously oppose such reduction, on the ground of its inevitable effect in depriving our own Tailors, Seamstresses, &c., of Employment and Bread. We might urge, indeed, that such change would prove disastrous in the long run, if regarded merely as a Revenue measure, by depriving large classes of our people of the ability to purchase and enjoy Foreign Products; but we should oppose it because of its disastrous influence on the comfort, independence, and thrift of those fellow-countrymen, apart from its tendency to divest them of ability to contribute to the Revenue. In other words, we hold that the welfare of the People and the full employment and fair reward of their Labor are matters of public concern, which no Government has any right to disregard. And we hold that such rates of duty should be levied on Foreign Products which come in competition with one or another department of our National

Indu
struc
trate
that
and
the d
in im
the e

"P
"hav
"we
advoc
duce
strict
and c
Coffee
produ
presur
Protec
be pro
theref
Home
Policy
work
to pro
Engla
produ
solely
exister

To
and an
on Wi
tection
and ce
where
If tho
will ta
the co
need
tories
tection

Industry as shall suffice to preserve that department from overthrow and destruction by reason of the cheaper labor, riper experience, or more concentrated capital of its Foreign rivals. And if it be still in its infancy, we hold that such a duty should be imposed on the Foreign product as will encourage and secure the proper development of the American production. This is the doctrine of Protection; the opposite, which insists that the Government, in imposing duties, should consider only the wants of its own Treasury and the easiest means of supplying them, is known as Free Trade.

3. Limitations.

"But are there no limitations to the policy of Protection? Would you have our Government undertake to foster the production of *every* article we may need or want within our own boundaries?" Certainly not. We advocate the Home Production of all articles, and such only, *as can be produced on our own soil with as little Labor as elsewhere*—or, more strictly, as would be required to produce them elsewhere, bring them to us, and carry to a foreign market home produce wherewith to pay for them. Coffee and Tea, for example, it is generally supposed, would not thrive and produce on our soil as they will in China, Java, and Brazil; and, under this presumption, no attempt has ever been made to foster their growth here by Protection. But Iron, Steel, Wool, Cloths, Hardware, &c., are known to be producible with as little labor in this country as anywhere else; and we therefore contend that they *ought* to be produced here to the extent of the Home demand for them respectively, and that a wise and beneficent Public Policy would foster and promote such production. And though fifty days work might be required, while American Iron-making was yet in its infancy, to produce here a ton of Iron which might be made by thirty days' labor in England, it would still be wise and politic to protect and encourage the home production of Iron, if it were evident, as it is, that this disparity was caused solely by the lack of experience and concentration of means here, and their existence on the other side of the Atlantic.

4. Fog Dispelled.

To declaim against a "*high Tariff*," as the matter in dispute, is slippery and ambiguous. The Tariff of 1842 had no higher rate of duty than that on Wines and Spirits in the Tariff of 1846. What we, who stand for Protection, demand, is simply that such rates be imposed as will secure a gradual and certain approximation toward the Home Production of whatever we need where Nature has interposed no obstacle of soil or climate to such production. If those who now oppose Protection on Iron, for instance, as unnecessary, will take hold and make at home, under the present duty, so much Iron as the country requires, we will cheerfully agree that no higher duty on Iron is needed. So of other products now imported. There are furnaces and factories in abundance for sale at less than their cost; and the enemies of Protection have only to prove that they believe what they say when they affirm

that Protection is needless and Manufactures thrifty without it, by buying these factories and furnaces, setting them at work, building more if requisite, and thus supplying the country with Metals, Wares, and Fabrics and we will heartily agree with them, not, indeed, that Protection is intrinsically wrong, but that our country has outgrown the need of it—as it some day must and will outgrow it. There are many branches of Industry which now need far lower duties to shield them from destruction than would have been requisite years ago; and some have, by the aid of Protection, wholly outgrown the necessity for Protection. If American Iron-making could enjoy adequate, assured and thorough Protection for ten years, we believe it would thenceforth defy Foreign competition under a low Revenue duty.

5. *Exports and Imports.*

No greater fallacy can be imagined than that which measures the prosperity or industry of a Nation by the extent or the increase of its Foreign Commerce. If our country were unable to grow Grain, it would inevitably export and import far more than it does now, since it must produce and export *something* wherewith to pay for its bread. So if it were now buying nearly all its Cloths, Wares, Hats, Boots, from Europe, as in its Colonial infancy, it would of course have more commerce and perhaps more shipping than at present. If it were now sending all its Flour to Europe and buying thence its Bread, its Foreign Commerce would be enormously greater than now, but at a ruinous cost and loss to the great body of its people. If our Grain crop were utterly cut off for the present year, our Foreign Commerce would necessarily be greatly extended. Those Nations and sections which show the largest relative Exports and Imports have rarely been distinguished for the thrift, independence and comfort of their people.

6. *The Balance of Trade.*

Nobody has ever contended that the naked fact that our Imports were officially valued higher than our Exports proves our Foreign Trade a losing one. It is quite true that some articles which cost comparatively little may be sold for a great deal—Ice, for example. Yet it cannot be seriously doubted that when our Imports, under a system of Ad Valorem duties which impels importers to swear down the value of their goods to the lowest possible notch, exceed by thirty millions per annum the declared value of our Exports, which are generally subject to specific duties or none in the ports to which they are sent, there must be a balance against us in our dealings with Europe.

But the fact that *there* is such a balance is put beyond doubt by the rates of Exchange, the movement of Specie and Stocks, and the negotiation of Loans. If we were paying Europe in our Products (including California Gold) for the Goods we are buying of her, we should not be sending Stocks to London for sale at the rate of millions per month, and sending agents thither to negotiate the sale of Railroad Bonds, State Bonds, County or City

Bond
inter
peop
rapid
child
does
cheq
other
more
from
Iron,
Capit
run o
duce.

Th
can c
whole
as the
insists
whate
and n
doctr
show
Econ

"
migh
is ma
open
servic
system
manu
Germ
them
our a
were
ductio
We
labor

He
Free
of dep
True,
branc
labor

Bonds, and every possible manufacture of paper which implies payment with interest by-and-by for Foreign Products eaten, drank, and worn out by our people to-day. The fact is undeniable that, as a people, we are running rapidly and heavily in debt to Europe, and mortgaging the earnings of our children to pay it off. And the excuse that we are building Railroads, &c., does not avail us. Europe is also building Railroads; Great Britain is chequered with them; but she does not owe their cost to the capitalists of other countries, because her people produce more than they consume, sell more than they buy, as ours do not. We have Labor enough standing idle from month to month and anxiously looking for employment to make all the Iron, Cloth, Wares, &c., for which we are running giddily in debt to Foreign Capitalists; yet our Free Trade policy tends to keep that Labor idle, and run our country deeper and deeper in debt for the Fabrics we ought to produce. Can this be right?

7. Trade and Labor—First Principles.

The Political Economy of Trade is very simple and easy. Buy where you can cheapest and sell where you can dearest, is its fundamental maxim; the whole system radiates from this. "Take care of yourself and let others do as they can," is its natural and necessary counterpart. Nay, this Economy insists that the best you can do for your neighbor and for mankind is to do whatever your individual interest shall prompt. That I do not misunderstand and may not be plausibly accused of misstating the scope of the Free Trade doctrine, so far as it applies to the action of states and communities, I will show by the following extract from "McCulloch's Principles of Political Economy:"

"Admitting, however, that the total abolition of the prohibitive system might force a few thousand workmen to abandon their present occupations, it is material to observe that *equivalent* new ones would, in consequence, be open to receive them; and that the *total aggregate demand for their services would not be in any degree diminished*. Suppose that, under a system of free trade, we imported a part of the silks and linens we now manufacture at home; it is quite clear, inasmuch as neither the French nor Germans would send us their commodities gratis, that we should have to give them an equal amount of British commodities in exchange; so that such of our artificers as had been engaged in the silk and linen manufactures, and were thrown out of them, would, in future, obtain employment in the production of the articles that must be exported as equivalents to the foreigner. We may, by giving additional freedom to commerce, change the species of labor in demand, but we *cannot lessen its quantity*."

Here, in the essay of one of the ablest and most admired doctors of the Free Trade school, you see the ground fairly marked out, and the consequences of depressing and destroying a particular branch of Home Industry enunciated. True, says the doctor; you throw many out of employment in that particular branch, but you thereby inevitably create a corresponding demand for their labor in some other capacity. The cotton-spinner, the wool-carder, the

carpet-weaver, may no longer have work in the vocations to which they were bred and in which they are skilled; but then there will be so much the more work in growing wheat, picking cotton, or salting pork. I do not see the advantage of the change to Labor even affirmed in this statement, though it is not difficult to imagine that Trade may experience a fallacious and transitory improvement. But, while the merchant may just as easily ship or sell one article as another, the laborer cannot with like facility change from casting iron to growing corn, from weaving broadcloth to chopping timber, and so on. To compel him to give up his accustomed employment and seek some other is generally to doom him to months of unwilling idleness followed by years of relatively ineffective toil. The overthrow of an important branch of National Industry is therefore a serious calamity to a great portion of the Laboring Class—a blow which will be felt for years.

8. Cheap Goods and Starving Laborers.

But, thus far, I have conceded the main point assumed by McCulloch and his school, that the destruction of a branch of Home Industry by the influx of rival Foreign fabrics is necessarily followed by a corresponding extension of some other branch or branches, giving employment to an equal amount of labor, and rendering the depression of Industry only temporary. That this is a mistake, a few moments' reflection will establish. It assumes that the consumption of a given article is not diminished by the transfer of its production from the consumers' neighborhood to a distant shore, and that wherever a community receives its supply of cloths or wares from abroad, it necessarily follows that some staple or staples of equal value will be taken of it by the supplying nation in return. To prove that the fact is not so, I cite the memorable instance of the Dacca weavers of India, as stated in Parliament by the distinguished Free Trader, Dr. Bowring:—

"I hold, Sir, in my hand, the correspondence which has taken place between the Governor General of India and the East India Company, on the subject of the Dacca hand-loom weavers. It is a melancholy story of misery so far as they are concerned, and as striking an evidence of the wonderful progress of manufacturing industry in this country. Some years ago, the East India Company annually received of the produce of the looms of India the amount of from six to eight millions of pieces of cotton goods. The demand gradually fell to somewhat more than one million, and has now nearly ceased altogether. In 1800, the United States took from India nearly eight hundred thousand pieces of cottons; in 1830, not four thousand. In 1800, one million of pieces were shipped to Portugal; in 1830, only twenty thousand. Terrible are the accounts of the wretchedness of the poor India weavers, reduced to absolute starvation. And what was the sole cause? The presence of the cheaper English manufacture—the production by the power-loom of the article which these unhappy Hindoos had been used for ages to make by their unimproved and hand-directed shuttles. Sir, it was impossible that they could go on weaving what no one would wear or buy. Numbers of them died of hunger; the remainder were, for the most

part,
chan
that
looms

"a
The
rema
Madn
have
many
Dacc
are a
to nu
comm

He
1. T
hand
such
looms
of the
suppl
exist
weav
mater
or ex
impor
accou
verge
the e
suffer
tion v
in the

He
notor
strate
to be

Pe
inten
ruino
that
its pr
to co
pervi

part, transferred to other occupations, principally agricultural. Not to have changed their trade was inevitable starvation. And at this moment, Sir, that Dacca district is supplied with yarn and cotton cloth from the power-looms of England. The language of the Governor General is:—

“ ‘European skill and machinery have superseded the produce of India. The court declare, that they are at last obliged to abandon the only remaining portion of the trade in cotton manufactures, in both Bengal and Madras, because, through the intervention of power-looms, the British goods have a decided advantage in quality and price. Cotton piece-goods, for so many ages the staple manufacture of India, seem thus forever lost. The Dacca muslins, celebrated over the whole world for their beauty and fineness, are also annihilated, from the same cause. And the present suffering, to numerous classes in India, is scarcely to be paralleled in the history of commerce.’ ”

Here, you see, are Mr. McCulloch's conditions made ready to his hand. 1. The people of India were formerly supplied with cotton fabrics from the hand-looms of their own Dacca weavers. 2. They are now supplied with such fabrics much cheaper (that is, at lower money prices) from the power-looms of England. 3. India being a dependency of Great Britain, the goods of the latter enter the former substantially free of duty, and have completely supplanted and ruined the native manufacture. 4. But though this has now existed some thirty years or more, the supplanted Hindoo spinners and weavers *do not* (at least, they certainly *did not*, and their case is not yet materially improved) find employment in new branches of industry created or expanded to provide the means of payment for the British fabrics imported in lieu of their own. 5. That in consequence, ‘Terrible are the accounts of the wretchedness of the poor Indian weavers, reduced to the verge of starvation.’ [Yes, and many of them beyond it.] And 6. That the evil was by no means confined to the weavers, but that the present suffering of ‘numerous classes’ (those whom the Free Traders say Protection would *tax* for the benefit of the weaver) “is scarcely to be paralleled in the history of Commerce.”

Here is the Free Traders' theory confronted by a Free Trader's notorious and undeniable facts. Can anything farther be needed to demonstrate the fallacy of the former, so far as it assumes unrestricted competition to be favorable to the interest of Labor?

9. A Grave Error and its Causes.

Political Economy is among the latest born of the Sciences. Mainly intent on the horrid game of War, with its various reverses and only less ruinous successes, it is but yesterday that the rulers of the world discovered that they had any duty to perform toward Industry, other than to interrupt its processes by their insane contentions, to devastate its fields, and ultimately to consume its fruits. And, when the truth did penetrate their scarcely pervious skulls, it came distorted and perverted by the resistance it had met,

by selfish and sinister influences, so that it had parted with all its vitality, and was blended with and hardly distinguishable from error. When it began to be dimly discerned that Government had a legitimate duty to perform towards Industry—that the latter might be cherished, improved, extended by the action of the former—legislators at once jumped to the conclusion that all possible legislation upon and interference with Industry must be beneficial. A Frederick the Great finds by experience that the introduction of new arts and industrial processes into his dominions increases the activity, thrift, and prosperity of his People; forthwith he rushes (as Macaulay and the Free Trade economists represent him) into the prohibition of *everything* but coin from abroad, and the production of everything at home, without considering the diversities of soil and climate, or the practicability of here prosecuting to advantage the business so summarily established. The consequence is, of course, a mischievous diversion of Labor from some useful and productive to profitless and unfruitful avocations. But this is not the worst. Some monarch finds himself unable to minister adequately to the extravagance of some new favorite or mistress; so he creates in her favor a Monopoly of the supply and sale of Salt, Coffee, or whatever else is not already monopolized, and styles it a “regulation of trade,” to prevent ruinous fluctuations, competitions, and excesses! Thus private ends are subserved under the pretence of public good, and the comforts of the people abridged or withheld to pander to the vices and sustain the lavish prodigality of princes and paramours.

From a contemplation of these abuses, pierced and uncovered by the expanding intelligence of the Eighteenth Century, the Political Economy of the Schools was evolved. In its origin a protest against existing abuses, it shared the common lot of all re-actions, in passing impetuously to an extreme the opposite of the error it went forth to combat. From a scrutiny and criticism of the gross abuses of the power of Government over Industry, it was impelled to the conclusion that no such power properly existed or could be beneficially exercised. Thus the Science became, in the hands of the latest professors of the ‘enlightened’ school, a simple and sweeping negation—a demand for incessant and universal abolishing—a suicidal science, demonstrating that to do nothing is the acme of governmental wisdom, and King Log the profoundest and greatest of monarchs.

These conclusions would have staggered the founders of the school; and yet it is difficult to resist the evidence offered to show that they are legitimately deduced by their disciples from the premises those founders themselves have laid down.

10. *Basis of Protection.*

There are reasons for hoping that the reaction against a sinister and false regulation of Industry has spent its force, and that the error which denies that any regulation can be beneficent, equally with the fraud which has cloaked schemes of personal aggrandisement under the pretence of guiding Industry aright, will yet cease to exert a controlling influence over the

affairs
has
Green
that
that
desira
produ
comf
as litt
may
Indus
rivals
efficie
differ
—nay
comp
(espe
side)
Indus
rival
price
to it,
neces
rival,
the u
within

Th
produ
merel
reason
each,
liable
of pi
foreign
some
to clin
correc
duced
Home
depre
theirs
vanqu
—not
intelli
count
here

affairs of Nations. Experience, the great corrector of delusive theories, has long since settled this point, that any attempt to grow Coffee in Greenland, or dig Coal from the White Mountains, must prove abortive; that same Experience, it seems most obvious, has by this time established that it is wise, it is well, for each nation to draw from its own soil every desirable and necessary product which that soil is as well calculated to produce as any other, and to fabricate within itself all articles of utility or comfort which it may ultimately produce as advantageously—that is, with as little labor—as they can be steadily produced elsewhere. To do this may require fostering legislation at first, to shield the infant branches of Industry against the formidable competition of their adult and muscular rivals, which would otherwise strangle them in the cradle; it may require efficient and steady Protection in after years, to counteract the effects of different standards of money values, and different rates of wages for Labor—nay, of the disturbing rivalries and ruinous excesses of mere foreign competition, which often leads to underselling at the door of a rival (especially if that rival be shut out from retaliation by duties on the other side) when living prices are maintained at home. A protected branch of Industry—cloth-making, for instance—might thus overthrow an unprotected rival interest in another nation without selling its products at an average price lower than that of the latter. Having its own Home Market secured to it, and unlimited power given it to disturb and derange the markets necessarily relied on by its rival, it would inevitably cripple and destroy that rival, as the mailed and practiced swordsman cuts down in the field of combat the unarmed and defenceless adversary whom fate or fatuity has thrown within his reach.

11. Protection and Prices.

Those who profess an inability to see how Protection can benefit the producer if it does not raise the average price of his product, contradict not merely the dictates of a uniform experience, but the clearest deductions of reason. The artisan who makes pianofortes, say at three hundred dollars each, having a capricious demand for some twenty or thirty per year, and liable at any time to be thrown out of business by the importation of a cargo of pianofortes—will he produce them cheaper or dearer, think you, if the foreign rivalry is cut off, and he is thence enabled to find a steady market for some twelve instruments per month? Admit that his natural tendency will be to cling to the old price, and thereby secure larger profits—this will be speedily corrected by a home competition, which will increase until the profits are reduced to the average profits of business. It will not be in the power of the Home as it is of the Foreign rival interests to depress his usual prices without depressing their own—to destroy his market yet preserve and even extend theirs—to crush him by means of cheaper labor than he can obtain. If vanquished now, it will be because his capacity is unequal to that of his rivals—not that circumstances inevitably predict and prepare his overthrow. No intelligent man can doubt that Newspapers, for example, are cheaper in this country than they would be if Foreign journals could rival and supplant them here as Foreign cloths may rival and supplant in our markets the correspond-

ing products of our own Country. The rule will very generally hold good, that those articles of home production which cannot be rivalled by Importation are and will be relatively cheaper than those of a different character.

12. *Theory and Practice.*

And here it may be well to speak more directly of the discrepancy between Theory and Practice which is so often affirmed in connection with our general subject. There are many who think the theory of Free Trade the correct, or at any rate the more plausible one, but who yet maintain, because they know by experience, that it fails practically of securing the good it promises. Hence they rush to the conclusion that a policy may be faultless in theory yet pernicious in practice, than which no idea can be more erroneous and pernicious. A good theory never yet failed to vindicate itself in practical operation—never can fail to do so. A theory can only fail because it is defective, unsound—lacks some of the elements which should have entered into its composition. In other words, the practical working is bad only because the theory is no better.

13. *Cheapness—Real and Nominal.*

Let us consider, for illustration, the fundamental maxim of Free Trade, "Buy where you can buy cheapest." This sounds well and looks plausible. But let us hold it up to the light! What is "cheapest?" Is it the smallest sum in coin? No—very far from it; and here is where the theory gives way. We do not, as a nation, produce coin—do not practically pay in coin. We pay for products in products, and the real question first to be resolved is, Whence can we obtain the desired fabrics for the smaller aggregate of our products—from the Foreign or the Home manufacturer? Take Woolen Cloths, for instance: We require of them, say One Hundred Millions' worth per annum. Now the point to be considered is not where we could buy most cloths for One Hundred Millions in money, for that we have not to pay; but where our surplus product of Pork, Lumber, Dairy Produce, Sheep, Wool, &c., &c., will buy the required Cloth most advantageously. The nominal or Money price paid for it may be Eighty Millions or One Hundred and Twenty Millions, and yet the larger sum be easier paid than the smaller.—that is, with a smaller amount of our Produce. The relative Money prices do not determine the real question of cheapness at all—they may serve, if implicitly relied on, to blind us to the merits of that question. In the absence of all regulation, the relative Money price will of course determine whether the cloths *shall* be imported or produced at home, but not whether they *should* be.

But this is not all. We may obtain a desired product to-day (and fitfully) cheaper abroad, and yet pay more for it in the average than if we produced it steadily at home. The question of cheapness is not determined by a single transaction, but by many.*

*Madison's Messages, 1:11-16-16.

A
abro
supp
coun
be b
them
of en
occu
The
time-
mean
labor
they
garm
pay a
"Buy
Free

B
indiv
Fairl
bene
it can
may
The
indiv
which
in ill
from
that
—qu
real,
class
produ
reduc
prosp
regio
enlar

Le
is pri
Whe
and r

And again: We can not buy to advantage abroad that which, being bought abroad, leaves whole classes of our people to famish at home. For instance suppose one hundred millions of garments are made by the women of this country yearly, at an average price of twenty-five cents each, and these could be bought abroad for two-thirds of that sum: Would it be wise so to buy them? Free Trade asserts that it would—that all the labour so thrown out of employment would be promptly absorbed in other and more productive occupations. But sad experience, common sense, humanity, say Not so. The truth is very different from this. The industry thus thrown out of its time-worn channels would find or wear others slowly and with great difficulty; meantime the hapless makers, no longer enabled to support themselves by labor, must be supported in idleness. By indirect if not by public charity they must somehow be subsisted; and our citizens will have bought their garments some twenty per cent. lower from abroad, but will be compelled to pay another price for them in charities and poor-rates. Such is the effect of "Buying where we can buy cheapest," in a low, short-sighted, miserly Free Trade view of cheapness.

14. *Self-Interest—Public and Private.*

But why, it is asked, should not a Nation purchase of others as freely as individuals of the same nation are permitted to trade with each other? Fairly as this question would seem to be put, there is a fatal fallacy lurking beneath its use of the term "nation." A nation *should* always buy where it can (in the long run) "buy cheapest," or most advantageously; where that may be is a question for the nation, through its legal organism, to decide. The query mistakenly assumes that the immediate, apparent interest of each individual purchaser is always identical with the interest of the community, which common sense as well as experience refutes. The lawyer or clergyman in Illinois may obtain his coat of the desired quality cheaper (for less money) from Paris than it can be fabricated in Illinois, yet it by no means follows, that it is the interest of Illinois to purchase her coats or cloths from Europe—quite the contrary is the fact. Nay, it would be easy to show that the real, permanent interest of the lawyer or clergyman himself—certainly of his class—is subserved by legislation which encourages and protects the home producer of those articles, not only because they improve in quality and are reduced in price under such a policy, but because the sources of his own prosperity and income are expanded or dried up as the industry of his own region is employed, its capacities developed, and its sphere of production enlarged and diversified.

15. *The Plow and the Loom should be Neighbors.*

Let us illustrate this truth more fully: The State of Illinois, for example, is primarily grain-growing, producing a surplus of five millions of bushels of Wheat and Indian Corn annually, worth in New York four millions of dollars, and requiring in return ten millions of yards of Cloths of various kinds and

qualities, costing in New York a like sum. In the absence of all legislation, she purchases and consumes mainly English cloths, which can be transmitted from Leeds to Chicago in a month, at a cost, including insurance and interest, of not more than five per cent., and there undersell any Illinois fabricator of cloths equal in quality and finish. Is it the real, permanent interest of Illinois (disregarding the apparent momentary interest of this or that class of persons in Illinois,) to persist in Free Trade? or, on the other hand, to concur in such legislation as will insure the production of her cloths mainly at home? Here is opened the whole question between Free Trade and Protection.

The advocate of Free Trade insists that the solution of the problem lies plain on the surface. The British broadcloth is offered in abundance for three dollars per yard; the American is charged twenty per cent. higher, and can not be afforded for three dollars. The true course is obvious—"Buy where you can buy cheapest." But the advocate of Protection answers that the real, intrinsic cheapness is not determined by the market price of the rival fabrics in coin—specie not being the chief staple of Illinois, nor produced there at all—but *where may the required Cloth be bought with the smallest amount of her Grain?* Is not this true? What avails it to Illinois that she may have Cloth from England twenty per cent. cheaper, if she is, by purchasing her supply there, constrained to sell her Grain at half price or less? Let us see, then, what is the inevitable fact:

That we can not buy, perpetually, without paying—that in paying for a single article, we must regard, not how much the payment is *called*, but how much it *is*, (that is, the amount of Products absorbed in paying for, or of the Labor expended in producing it)—we assume to be obvious or sufficiently demonstrated. Let us now consider what will be the inevitable cost to Illinois—the *real* cost—of one million yards of broadcloths obtained from England, as compared with the cost of the same cloth produced at home.

The average value of Wheat throughout the world is not far from one dollar per bushel, varying largely, of course, in different localities; in the heart of a grain-growing region, away from manufactures or navigation, it must fall greatly below that standard; in other districts, where consumption considerably exceeds production, rendering a resort to importation necessary, the price rises above the average standard. The price at a given point is determined by its proximity to a market for its surplus or a surplus for its market. Great Britain does not produce as much as will feed her own population; hence her average price must be governed by the rate at which she can supply her deficiency from abroad; Illinois produces in excess, and the price there must be governed by the rate at which she can dispose of her surplus, including the cost of its transportation to an adequate market. In other words (all regulation being thrown aside), the price which England must pay must be the price at the most convenient foreign marts of adequate supply, adding the cost of transportation; while the grain of Illinois will be worth to her its price in the ultimate market of its surplus, less the cost of sending it there.

Now, the great grain-growing plains of Poland and Southern Russia, with capabilities of production never yet half explored, even—with Labor

chea
in th
at I
Blac
be a
and
pric
and
from
them

T
nece
prod
Man
Grea
Eng
good
AND
SELL
TUR

T
cost
cons
of Il
next
trans
cent
hund
dolla
the

N
so fa
tura
Illin
is B
adeq
let t
We
ever
vanc
grain
tran
atta
men

N
lars
own

cheaper than it ever can or should be in this country—are producing Wheat in the interior at fifty cents a bushel or lower, so that it is ordinarily obtained at Dantzic on the Baltic for ninety cents per bushel, and at Odessa on the Black Sea for eighty, very nearly. With a Free Trade in grain, Britain can be abundantly supplied from Europe alone at a cost not exceeding one dollar and ten cents per bushel; with a competition from America, the average price in her ports would more probably range from one dollar to one dollar and six cents. What, then, is the prospect for Illinois, buying her cloths from Great Britain, and compelled to sell *somewhere* her grain to pay for them?

That she could not sell elsewhere her surplus to such extent as would be necessary, is obvious. The ability of the Eastern States to purchase the produce of her fertile prairies depends on the activity and stability of their Manufactures—depends, in short, on the market for their manufactures in the Great West. The markets to which we can resort, in the absence of the English, are limited indeed. In point of fact, the rule will hold substantially good, though trivial exceptions are presented, that IN ORDER TO PURCHASE AND PAY FOR THE MANUFACTURES OF GREAT BRITAIN, ILLINOIS MUST SELL TO THAT COUNTRY THE GREAT BULK OF HER SURPLUS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIONS.

The rates at which she must *sell* this surplus, we have already seen; the cost of transporting it is easily computed. Seventy-five cents per bushel is considerably below the average cost of transporting wheat from the prairies of Illinois to England; but that may be assumed as a fair average for the next ten years, in view of the improvements being made in the means of transportation. There is then left to the Illinois farmer—to Illinois—thirty cents per bushel as the net proceeds of her surplus wheat, or one million five hundred thousand dollars for the five millions of bushels—purchasing, at three dollars per yard, five hundred thousand yards of broadcloth. This would be the net product under Free Trade.

Now the same inevitable law which depresses the price of wheat in Illinois so far below that prevailing in England, so long as the one is wholly Agricultural, the other predominantly Manufacturing, will as surely raise the price in Illinois SO SOON AND SO FAST AS A SUFFICIENT MARKET FOR HER SURPLUS IS BROUGHT NEARER TO HER DOORS. Let that surplus be arrested by an adequate market in New England, and its price will rise to fifty cents a bushel; let the supply of her Manufactured products be drawn by Illinois from points West of the Alleghenies, and it will rise to seventy-five cents; and, whenever they are mainly produced on her own territory, the price will have advanced to one dollar per bushel. In other words, the net produce of her grain to Illinois will be the average price throughout the world, less the cost of transporting it to the point at which an adequate market for her surplus is attained. There may be casual and special exceptions, but this is the fundamental law.

Now it is evident that, though Illinois may buy her Cloths for fewer *dollars* from England, she can buy them with fewer *bushels* of Grain from our own Manufactories, and fewer still when the progress of improvement, under

a steady and careful Protection to our Industry, shall have established most branches of manufacture on her own soil. She may pay twenty-five per cent higher nominal prices for her fabrics, and yet obtain them at one-half the actual cost at which she formerly obtained them from abroad. In other words, by bringing the producers of Cloth from England to America, and placing them side by side with the producers of Grain, she has effected an enormous SAVING OF LABOR—of that Labor, namely, which has before employed in transporting Grain and Cloth from continent to continent. One hundred thousand grain-growers and cloth-makers produce just as much now as they did with four thousand miles of land and water between them, while they no longer require the services of another hundred thousand persons as boatmen, sailors, shippers, forwarders, &c., to interchange their respective products. These now become producers themselves. By thus diminishing vastly the number of non-producers and adding to that of producers, the aggregate of production is immensely increased, increasing in like measure the dividends of Capital and the rewards of Labor.

16. *The Object of Protection.*

Such is the process by which wise Protection increases the prosperity of a country, quite apart from its effect in discouraging ruinous fluctuations and competition, whereby thousands of producers are frequently thrown out of employment, and thence out of bread. It is this multiplying and diversifying of the departments of Home Industry, bringing the farmer, the artisan, the manufacturer, into immediate contact with each other, and enabling them to interchange their products without the intervention of several non-producers, which is justly regarded as the great end of an enlightened and paternal policy. To guard against the changes, fluctuations, depressions, which an unbounded competition and rivalry are sure to induce, is also well worthy of effort; but the primary aim of Protection is to secure a *real* cheapness of production and supply, instead of the nominal, indefinite, deceptive cheapness which Free Trade obtains by looking to the money price only of the staples purchased.

17. *The Need of Protection.*

—But why, it is asked, have we need of any legislation on the subject, if the Home Trade and Home Production be so much more beneficial than Foreign? The answer to this question is made obvious by the foregoing illustrations. The *individual* farmer, lawyer, teacher, of Illinois might, with Free Trade, obtain the Foreign fabrics cheaper than the Domestic, escaping, or seeming to escape, the consequent reduction in the price of Domestic staples which we have seen to be the result of a resort to distant countries for the great bulk of desirable fabrics; but the *community* could not escape it. On the other hand, the individual might perceive clearly the true policy to be pursued by all; but how could he effect its adoption except through the action of the Government? The Farmer, producing a thousand

bush
Man
price
rema
purpo
still s
On
Econ
too g
and n
ledge
impel
and i

Bu
the F
prece
amass
vocati
weal,
inditi
ble; M
Social
able.
identi
keepe
dividu
intere
why o
But it
ultima
ests o
Centu
age—
to a t
Every
ested
are re
save
not all
It can
follow
that t
and th
should
sound

bushels of Grain, might see clearly that the *general* encouragement of Home Manufactures would build up a Home Market for Grain at a more adequate price; but *his* buying Domestics instead of Foreign, while importation remained unrestricted, and the majority purchased abroad, would answer no purpose whatever. It would only condemn him to sell his products for a still smaller return than the meagre one which Free Trade vouchsafed him.

On this point it seems obvious that the inculcations of our leading Political Economists must be revised—the solecisms which they embody have grown too glaring and vital to be longer endured. The distinction between real and merely nominal or money cheapness in matters of supply must be acknowledged and respected, or the flagrant contrarieties of Fact and Theory will impel the practical world to distrust and ultimately to discard the theory and its authors.

18. *Laissez Faire—Let us Alone.*

But not less mistaken and short-sighted than the First Commandment of the Free Trade Decalogue—"Buy where you can cheapest"—is the kindred precept, "*Laissez faire*"—"Let us alone." That those who are profiting, amassing wealth and rolling in luxury, from the proceeds of some craft or vocation gainful to them but perilous and fraught with evil to the common weal, should strive to lift this maxim from the mire of selfishness and heartless indifference to others' woes to the dignity of Statesmanship, is not remarkable; but that any one seriously claiming to think and labor for National or Social well-being, should propound and defend it, this is as amazing as lamentable. Regarded in the light of Morality, it can not stand a moment: it is identical in spirit with the sullen insolence of Cain—"Am I my brother's keeper?" If it be, indeed, a sound maxim, and the self-interest of each individual—himself being the judge—be necessarily identical with the common interest, then it is difficult to determine why Governments should exist at all—why constraint should in any case be put on the action of any rational being. But it needs not that this doctrine of '*Laissez faire*' should be traced to its ultimate results, to show that it is inconsistent with any true idea of the interests of Society or the duties of Government. The Genius of the Nineteenth Century—the expanding Benevolence and all-embracing Sympathy of our age—emphatically repudiate and condemn it. Everywhere is man awaking to a truer and deeper regard for the welfare and worth of his brother. Everywhere is it beginning to be felt that a bare *opportunity* to live unimpeded if he can find and appropriate the means of subsistence—as some savages are reported to cast their new-born children into the water, that they may save alive the sturdy who can swim, and leave the weak to perish—is not all that the community owes to its feeble and less fortunate members. It can not have needed the horrible deductions of Malthus, who, admirably following out the doctrine of '*Laissez faire*' to its natural result, declares that the earth can not afford an adequate subsistence to all human offspring, and that those who can not find food without the aid of the community should be left to starve!—to convince this generation of the radical unsoundness of the premises from which such revolting conclusions can be drawn.

Our standard Political Economists may theorize in this direction as dogmatically as they will, modestly pronouncing their own views liberal and enlightened, and all others narrow and absurd; but though they appear to win the suffrages of the subtle Intellect, the great Heart of Humanity refuses to be thus guided—nay, insists on impelling the entire social machinery in an exactly opposite direction. The wide and wider diffusion of a public provision for General Education and for the support of the destitute Poor—inefficient as each may thus far have been; is of itself a striking instance of the triumph of a more benignant principle over that of ‘*Laissez faire*.’ The enquires, so vigorously and beneficently prosecuted in our day, into the Moral and Physical, Intellectual and Social condition of the depressed Laboring Classes, of Great Britain especially—of her Factory Operatives, Colliers, Miners, Silk-Weavers, &c., &c., and the beneficent results which have followed them, abundantly prove that, for Governments no less than Communities, any consistent following of the ‘Let us alone’ principle, is not merely a criminal dereliction from duty—it is henceforth utterly impossible. Governments must be impelled by a profound and wakeful regard for the common interests of the People over whom they exercise authority, or they will not be tolerated. It is not enough that they repress violence and outrage as speedily as they can; this affords no real security, even to those exposed to wrong-doing: they must search out the *causes* of evil, the influences which impel to its perpetration, and labor zealously to effect their removal. They might re-enact the bloody code of Draco, and cover the whole land with fruitful gibbets, yet, with a people destitute of Morality and Bread—nay, destitute of the former alone—they could not prevent the iteration of every crime which a depraved imagination might suggest. That theory of Government which affirms the power to punish, yet in effect denies the right to prevent evil, will be found as defective in its Economical inculcations as in its relations to the Moral and Intellectual wants of Mankind.

19. The Right of Labor.

The great principle that the Labourer has a Right of Property in that which constitutes his only means of subsistence, is one which can not be too broadly affirmed nor too earnestly insisted on. ‘A man’s trade is his estate;’ and with what justice shall one-fourth of the community be deprived of their means of subsistence in order that the larger number may fare a little more advantageously? The cavil at the abuse of this principle to obstruct the adoption of all labor-saving machinery, etc., does not touch the vitality of the principle itself. All Property, in a just constituted state, is held subject to the right of Eminent Domain residing in the State itself;—when the public good requires that it should be taken for public uses, the individual right must give way. But suppose it were practicable to introduce to-morrow the products of foreign needle-work, for instance, at such prices as to supplant utterly garments made by our own countrywomen, and thereby deprive them entirely of this resource for a livelihood—would it be *morally right* to do this? Admit that the direct cost of the fabrics required would be con-

sider
class
It do
gene

I
quen
ducti
ed!—
more
the A
To sa
the th
overw
by an
tions,
destru
tion o
the H
the cl
which
their
were
and st

An
have a
the co
tic, ha
scrupu
effecte
an in
virtue
have p
vent i
lending
labor-
unders
cotton
Englis
nature
workin

siderably less, should we be justified in reducing a numerous and worthy class, already so meagerly rewarded, to absolute wretchedness and pauperism; It does not seem that an affirmative answer can deliberately proceed from any generous heart."

20. *Loss of Employment not Compensated.*

I am not forgetting that Free Trade asserts that the necessary consequence of such rejection of the Domestic in favor of a cheaper Foreign production would be to benefit our whole People, the displaced workwomen included!—that these would, by inevitable consequence, be absorbed in other and more productive employments. I am only remembering that facts, bold as the Andes and numerous as forest-leaves, confront and refute this assumption. To say nothing of the many instances in our own country's experience, where the throwing out of employment of a whole class of our citizens, owing to the overwhelming influx of Foreign fabrics rivaling theirs, has been followed, not by an increase but a diminished demand and reward for Labor in other avocations, I need but refer to the notorious instance already cited—that of the destruction of the Hand-Loom Manufactures of India through the introduction of the cheaper product of the English power-looms. Not only were the Hand-Loom Weavers themselves reduced to beggary and starvation by the change—no demand whatever for labor arising to take place of that which had been destroyed—but *other classes* were inevitably involved in their calamity, while none in India realized any perceptible benefit unless it were a very few 'merchant princes,' who fed and fattened on the misery and starvation of the millions of their doomed countrymen.

21. *Political Action Indispensable.*

And here, as everywhere, it is observable that no *individual* action could have arrested the mighty evil. If every person intelligent enough to perceive the consequences of encouraging the Foreign instead of the Domestic fabric, had early and resolutely resolved never to use any but the latter, and had scrupulously persevered in the course so resolved on, what would it have effected? Nothing. It would have been but a drop in the bucket. But an independent Government of India, with intelligence to understand and virtue to discharge its duties to the people under its protecting care, would have promptly met the Foreign fabric with an import duty sufficient to prevent its general introduction, at the same time prompting, if needful, and lending every aid to the exertions of its own manufacturers to imitate the labor-saving machinery and processes by which the foreigner was enabled to undersell the home-producer of cotton fabrics on the very soil to which the cotton-plant was indigenous, and from which the fibre was gathered for the English market. Such a Government would have perceived that, in the very nature of things, it could not be permanently advantageous to the great working mass of either people that the Cotton should be collected and trans-

ported from the plains of India, about twice the diameter of the Globe, to England, there fabricated into cloths, and thence, at some two years' end, be found diffused again over those very plains of India, to clothe its original producers. Obviously, here is an enormous waste of time and labor, to no end of general beneficence—a waste which would be avoided by planting and fostering to perfection the manufacture of the Cotton on the soil where it grew and among the People who produced and must consume it. This policy would be prosecuted in no spirit of envy or hostility to the English manufacture—very far from it—but in perfect conformity to the dictates of universal as well as national well-being. The cost of these two immense voyages, and the commercial complications which they involve, though falling unequally on the Agricultural and manufacturing community respectively, yet fall in some measure on the latter as well as the former; they inevitably diminish the intrinsic reward of labor on either side, and increase the mischances which affect the steadiness of demand for that labor and intercept that reward. Protection, as we have seen in considering the argument of cheapness, must increase the actual reward of both classes of producers, by diminishing the number of non-producers and the amount of their subtraction, as such, from the aggregate produced. Yet this is the policy stigmatized by the self-styled and enlightened Political Economists as narrow and partial!—as looking only to local and regardless of general good!

22. Moral Influences of Protection.

The moral effects of Protection, as resulting in a more intimate relation and a more symmetrical proportion between the various departments of Industry, cannot be too strongly insisted on. Capital, under the present system of Society, has a natural tendency to centralization; and the manufacture of all light and costly fabrics, especially if their cheap fabrication involves the employment of considerable capital, is subject to a similar law. With universal Free Trade, those countries which are now foremost in manufactures, especially if they at the same time possess (as is the case) a preponderance in Capital also, will retain and extend that ascendancy for an indefinite period. They will seem to afford the finer fabrics cheaper than they can be elsewhere produced; they will at any rate crush with ease all daring attempts to rival them in the production. That this seeming cheapness will be wholly deceptive, we have already seen, but that is not to our present purpose. The tendency of Free Trade is to confine Agriculture and Manufactures to different spheres; to make of one country or section, a Cotton plantation; of another a Wheat field; of a third a vast Sugar estate; of a fourth an immense Manufactory, &c., &c. One inevitable effect of this is to render the laborer more dependent on the capitalist or employer, than he otherwise would be; to make the subsistence of whole classes depend on the caprices of trade—the endurance of Foreign prosperity and the steadiness of foreign tastes. The number of hirelings must be vastly greater under this policy, than that which brings the farmer and manufacturer, the artisan, into immediate vicinage and daily contact with each other, and enables them to interchange their products in good part without invoking the agency of any

third
defray
trade.
can r
the c
rewar
never
small
soon r
depend
disguis

But
comfo
to the
bly su
Moral
has be
child
sees th
around
a great
own p
one w
exertio
siderat
import

I ca
dent b
Labour
of Cap
Wages
of Soc
French
as com
hanced
in Am
the cor
creased
Labour
field th
nation
fully an
aggreg
produc

third party, and generally without being taxed on whatever they consume, to defray the expense of vast transportation and of the infinite complications of trade. A country or extensive district whose product is mainly exported, can rarely or never boast a substantial, intelligent and virtuous Yeomanry: the condition of the laborer is too precarious and dependent—his average reward too meager. It may have wealthy capitalists and Merchants, but never a numerous middle class, nor a flourishing, increasing proportion of small but independent proprietors. The fluctuations of supply and demand soon reduce all but the few to the dead level of indigence and a precarious dependence on wages for a subsistence, unless prevented by absolute and undisguised slavery.

23. Its Intellectual Bearings.

But not alone in its influence on the pecuniary condition and physical comfort of the mass is the state of things produced by Free Trade conducive to their Social degradation. The external influences by which they are visibly surrounded are likewise adverse to their Intellectual development and Moral culture. The Industry of a People is, to a far greater extent than has been imagined, an integral and important part of its Education. The child whose infancy is spent amidst the activity of a diversified Industry, who sees the various processes of Agriculture, Manufactures, Arts, in progress all around him, will be drawn out to a clearer and larger maturity of intellect—a greater fullness of being—will be more certain to discover and adopt his own proper function in life—his sphere of highest possible usefulness—than one whose early years are passed in familiarity with the narrower range of exertion which any one branch of industry can afford. Foreign as this consideration may be to the usual range of Economic Science, it is too vitally important to be disregarded.

24. Capital: Labour, and Wages.

I can not assent to the vital proposition, so generally assumed as self-evident by the Free-Trade Economists, that the ability to give employment to Labour is always in proportion to the amount of Capital, and that the increase of Capital as compared with Population necessarily leads to an increase of Wages. I will not deny that such *ought to be* the result in a perfect state of Society; that it *is* the result is plainly contradicted by glaring facts. The French Revolution diminished greatly the aggregate of Property in France as compared with its Population, yet the average rewards of Labour were enhanced thereby. The amount of Capital as compared to Population is less in America than England, yet the rewards of Labour are here higher. On the contrary, there are many instances where the Wealth of a People has increased, yet the conditions and rewards of its Labourers, with the demand for Labour, have receded. Political Economy has yet to take to itself a broader field than that of discovering the means whereby the aggregate Wealth of a nation may be increased; it must consider also how its Labour may be most fully and equally rewarded, and by what means the largest proportion of the aggregate increase of wealth and comforts may be secured to those who have produced them.

25. Conclusion.

I am not unaware that at present the current of opinion on this subject sets, or seems to set, against me—that the dead fish all float that way. I realize that the great majority of Authors and Professors who treat of the Political Economy are Free Traders—that their writings are admired and commended as liberal, beneficent, and of immutable soundness, while ours of the contrary part are derided as narrow, partial, and impelled by a transient or selfish expediency. I perceive that the paramount tendency of our time is toward Adventure and Speculation—that the great mass of the educated and Intellectual are making haste to be rich, and generally by buying and selling other men's labour or its fruits rather than by labouring assiduously themselves. Commerce and Importation amass fortunes, and enrich the great journals with lucrative advertising, and found professorships, and fashion the public sentiment of the comfortable class with regard to Labour, its position and requirements. I see that the very progress hitherto made in the Useful Arts under the shelter of the Protective Duties, the progress still making by virtue of the impulse thus given, may render the existence of decided and stringent Protection less vitally, obviously necessary than it was in the infancy of our Country and her Industry. Yet I see, too, that we who stand for Protection read, study, and endeavour to understand both sides of the question—are familiar with our adversaries' arguments, have considered them, and think we see why and wherein they are mistaken and inconclusive, while they habitually treat our arguments with studied contempt or with a radical misconception which argues gross ignorance or inattention. I can not doubt that this country is now losing many millions per annum for want of a more efficient and systematic Protection of its Industry, though some articles are really, others partially protected by it, and that our Labour is receiving in the average at least one-eighth less than it would be under a thoroughly Protective Tariff, while hundreds of thousands stand idle and earn nothing whom that Tariff would amply employ and adequately reward. So believing, I can not but hope that time, and discussion, and contemplation, and the cooling down of party asperities, and the progress of events, will work a silent but thorough revolution in our National Councils, and that the adequate and comprehensive Protection of Industry will again be regarded by legislators and people as among the most urgent, essential, and beneficent duties of the Federal Government.

REPORT

OF THE

Public Meeting of Delegates

FROM VARIOUS PARTS OF CANADA, HELD IN THE

ST. LAWRENCE HALL, TORONTO,

On Wednesday, the 14th of April, 1858.

AND

PROCEEDINGS OF THE "ASSOCIATION

FOR THE

PROMOTION OF CANADIAN INDUSTRY."

PET
TI

T
men
to H
ada
the
Man
Mee
tee
Mee
este
In a
place
Refo
tivel
cessi
Circ
in al
a sca
gene
An
Railw
for on
from
ral M
at the
where
treal
class
port a

RESOLUTIONS,

PETITION, AND CLASSIFICATION OF ARTICLES FOR DUTIES, ADOPTED AT A PUBLIC MEETING OF DELEGATES CONVENED IN TORONTO, THE 14TH OF APRIL, 1858,
TO CONSIDER THE NECESSITY OF RE-ADJUSTING THE PRESENT CUSTOMS' TARIFF.

The present movement in favour of such a re-adjustment of the Tariff as will afford greater encouragement to Home manufactures, was inaugurated in Upper Canada at a numerous meeting of gentlemen favourable to the object, held at the Rooms of the Board of Arts and Manufactures, in Toronto, on the 24th ult. At that Meeting, resolutions were passed appointing a Committee to make the necessary arrangement for a General Meeting of Merchants, Manufacturers and others interested, to be held in Toronto, on the 14th of April, inst. In accordance with these resolutions, the Committee placed themselves in communication with the Tariff Reform Association of Montreal, which has been actively engaged for the last two years in urging the necessity of carrying out the changes here proposed. Circulars were also sent to the principal Manufacturers in all parts of Canada, inviting their co-operation, and a scale of duties submitted for their consideration at the general meeting.

Arrangements were made with the Grand Trunk Railway to convey delegates to and from the meeting, for one fare, with the view of insuring a large attendance from distant parts of the country. Previous to the General Meeting, a preliminary meeting of Delegates was held at the Rooms of the Board of Arts and Manufactures, where the schedules of duties recommended by the Montreal and Toronto Committees, were discussed, and the classification of articles embodied in the following Report agreed upon, to be submitted to the meeting

The General Meeting was largely attended by gentlemen from all parts of the country. Among those present, were Messrs. I. Buchanan, M.P.P.; W. B. Jarvis, Toronto; W. Rodden, Montreal; E. Atwater, Montreal; J. L. Mathewson, Montreal; M. Anderson, London; D. C. Gunn, Hamilton; J. Cummings, Hamilton; D. Smart, Port Hope; D. Crawford, Toronto; T. Brunskill, Toronto; J. M. Williams, Hamilton; W. F. Harris, Montreal; G. Sheppard, Toronto; D. McLeod, Port Hope; R. Hay, Toronto; T. F. Miller, Montreal; R. McKinnon, Caledonia; B. Clark, Hamilton; Rice Lewis, Toronto; J. Buntin, Toronto; C. Brown, Montreal; J. G. Bowes, Toronto; G. P. M. Ball, Louth; J. Helms, Jun., Pt. Hope; D. F. Jones, Gananoque; John Shaw, Kingston; W. Barber, Georgetown; J. Hilton, Montreal; J. Gartshore, Dundas; A. McNaughten, Newcastle; C. Brent, Port Hope; J. E. Pell, Toronto; C. Garth, Montreal; W. Parkyn, Montreal; C. W. Bangs, Ottawa; Jas. Hickie, Kingston; R. B. Colton, Brockville; R. Colman, Lyn; Jas. Crombie, Galt; A. Drummond, Belleville; J. Keeler, Colborne; A. Buntin, Montreal; John Rankin, Dundas; G. Towner, Merrickville; H. O. Burritt, Ottawa; C. O. Benedict, Niagara; J. C. Pennock, Colborne; R. Patterson, Belleville; M. Bowell, Belleville; James Brown, Belleville; R. Featherstone, Kingston; W. Weir, Toronto; B. Lyman, Montreal.

C. Rogers, Port Hope; H. Crae, Port Hope; S. Pel-
lar, Oshawa; J. Jessup, Oshawa; J. Fewster, Oshawa;
W. H. Orr, Oshawa; John Treleven, Oshawa; H. A.
Massay, Newcastle, &c. &c. &c.

Mr. W. B. Jarvis was called to the Chair, and Mr.
W. Weir appointed to act as Secretary.

The Chairman explained the objects of the Meeting
after which the following resolutions were put and
carried.

Moved by Mr. Isaac Buchanan, M.P.P., seconded by
Mr. E. Atwater, of Montreal,

Resolved, That this meeting, composed of merchants,
manufacturers, and other friends of Canadian industry,

from all parts of the Province, whilst acknowledging the advantages bestowed on the inhabitants of Canada, through the enlightened policy adopted by Her Majesty's Government and Parliament, permitting Her Majesty's subjects in this portion of the British Dominions to deal with every matter touching their material welfare, cannot shut their eyes to the fact that Canadian legislation hitherto, has failed to lay any solid foundation for permanent prosperity in the country.

Moved by Mr. Thomas Brunskill, seconded by Mr. G. P. M. Ball, of Louth,

Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, the prevailing depression of the trade of the Province is greatly owing to the present tariff being based on erroneous principles, admitting as it does, at low rates of duty, the manufactures of other countries, that can be made by a class of labor now in Canada, unfitted for agricultural pursuits, and charging high rates on articles that cannot be produced in the country, thereby preventing the development of the natural resources of the colony, as well as injuring Canada as a field for Immigration.

Moved by Mr. W. Rodden, of Montreal, seconded by Mr. D. C. Gunn, of Hamilton,

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Meeting, if the Tariff now in force were re-adjusted, and the accompanying Postulates adopted as the principles upon which a scale of duties should be arranged, every class of the community would be materially benefitted by the change, without any reduction in the Revenue arising therefrom; whilst its immediate effects would be to dissipate the despondency perceptible in every quarter, create a feeling of encouragement to Capitalists on the spot; draw the attention of foreigners to our magnificent resources for Manufacturing, and to the certain improved demand for all kinds of goods

made within our boundaries; cause a spirit of enterprise to spring up among our Artizans, and give fresh vigor to our Agricultural and Laboring populations, besides instilling additional confidence into the minds of those holding and seeking after our Public Securities—the List of Articles and Duties herewith submitted, being intended as a guide to the General Committee, to be appointed for carrying out the objects of this Meeting.

POSTULATES.

1. All raw material upon which there is but a small amount of labour expended prior to its importation, and leaving the larger proportion of labour to be performed in Canada, it is considered should be admitted free, or at a duty not to exceed 2½ per cent.

2. All articles entering largely into consumption in this country, and which Canada cannot produce, such as Tea, Coffee, Sugar, Molasses, &c., should not be charged with a high rate of duty, but should be admitted free, or at the lowest possible rate consistent with the requirements of the Revenue.

3. Merchandize in the Dry Goods, Hardware and Crockery Trades, being articles of luxury or for use, and not likely for some time to be manufactured in this country, and of which some are used to form parts of the goods and wares manufactured in Canada, should be chargeable with a medium rate of duty of about 15 per cent, as at present, or not to exceed 20 per cent, but at the rate of about 10 per cent below what may be charged on articles coming directly into competition with our own manufactured productions.

4. All manufactures in Wood, Iron, Tin, Brass, Copper, Leather, India Rubber, &c., competing with our industrial products, as more fully specified in the proposed list of articles and duties, now submitted and adopted, should be charged a duty of about 25 per cent, excepting:—

* Books, Drawings, &c., which should be charged with a duty of 10 to 15 per cent.

Cottons and Woolens, Cordage, Lines, and Twines, 20 per cent.

Clothing and Wearing Apparel, 30 per cent.

Moved by Mr. D. Smart, of Port Hope, seconded by Mr. John Shaw, of Kingston,

Resolved, That the above Resolutions be embodied

* The Executive Committee has received a memorial against the proposed duty on Books, &c., which will be carefully considered.

in a Petition, to be presented to the different Branches of the Legislature, praying that the subjects referred to therein, be taken into immediate consideration, with a view to the changes proposed in the tariff, taking effect during the present Session

Moved by Mr. J. E. Pell, of Toronto, seconded by Mr.

Murray Anderson, of London,

Resolved,—That a General Committee be appointed to carry out the views of this meeting, and that they be instructed to place themselves in communication with the Inspector General, and the members of both Branches of the Legislature who are favorable to the encouragement of Home Manufactures, with the view of obtaining a speedy remedy for the grievances under which every department of home industry now suffers. The Committee to be composed as follows—five to form a quorum :

Messrs. I. Buchanan, M.P.P.,
W B Jarvis, Toronto
W Rodden, Montreal
W Weir, Toronto
E Atwater, Montreal
J L Mathewson, Mont'l
M Anderson, London
D C Gunn, Hamilton
J Cummings, Hamilton
D Smart, Port Hope
D Crawford, Toronto
T Brunskill, Toronto
J M Williams, Hamilton
W F Harris, Montreal
W Barber, Georgetown
J Hilton, Montreal
J Gartshore, Dundas
A McNaughten, Newcastle
O Brent, Port Hope
J E Pell, Toronto
C Garth, Montreal
W Parkyn, "
C W Bangs, Ottawa
Jas Hickie, Kingston
R B Colton, Brockville
R Colman, Lyn
Jas Crombie, Galt

Messrs. G Sheppard, Toronto
D McLeod, Port Hope
R Hay, Toronto
T F Miller, Montreal
R McKinnon, Caledonia
B Clark, Hamilton
E Leonard, London
J Buntin, Toronto
C Brown, Montreal
J G Bowes, Toronto
G P M Ball, Louth
J Helms, Jun., Pt Hope
D F Jones Gananoque
John Shaw, Kingston
A Drummond, Belleville
J Keeler, Colborne
A Buntin, Montreal
John Rankin, Dundas
G Towner, Merrickville
H O Burritt, Ottawa
C O Benedict, Niagara
J C Pennock, Castleton
R Patterson, Belleville
M Howell, Belleville
James Brown, Belleville
R Featherston, Kingston

PETITION

*To the Honorable the Legislative Assembly of the Province
of Canada in Parliament assembled :*

The memorial of the undersigned merchants, manufacturers and others from the various sections of the said Province, assembled in public meeting at Toronto,
RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH :

That your memorialists desire to call the attention of your Honorable House to the depression which all branches of manufactures and commerce now suffer in the Province, and to the necessity that exists for a consideration of the causes to which this depression is wholly or in part attributable.

That in the opinion of your memorialists, the difficulties now experienced by all classes of the community, are, in a large degree, the consequence of the unfair competition to which the present tariff of the Province exposes its various branches of industry; and that with a view to the promotion of general prosperity, a re-adjustment of the scale of duties levied upon imports, has become an absolute necessity.

That the existing tariff is based upon erroneous principles, inasmuch as it admits, at low rates of duty, the manufactures of other countries, which are thus brought into collision with a class of labor now in Canada not fitted for agricultural pursuits; and charges high rates on articles that cannot be produced within our boundaries.

That apart from the prevailing depression, the present Provincial tariff operates disadvantageously by preventing the influx of capital, which under due encouragement, would be introduced and applied for the development of our natural resources; and, moreover, to limit the scope of industry as to offer impediments in the way of skill, and largely lessen the attractiveness of Canada as a field for immigration.

That a re-adjustment of the tariff, if governed by principles in themselves just, will materially benefit every class of the community, without in any manner crippling the Customs' revenue.

That in the judgment of your memorialists such a re-adjustment should recognize as distinctive principles: the admission, duty free, or at low rates of duty, of raw materials for manufacture not produced in the province. The admission, free of duty, or at low rates, of articles entering largely into general consumption and not competing with the natural products of Canada,—and the leveying of higher duties upon articles entering into competition with articles manufactured, or which with due encouragement, may be manufactured by our people.

That your memorialists, representing diversified industrial and mercantile interests, and having ample opportunities of ascertaining the wants and convictions of the classes with whom they co-operate, urge upon Your Hon. House the expediency, in the change of the tariff sought, of proceeding upon the following positions as guiding points in the work of tariff reform:—

1. All raw material upon which there is but a small amount of labor expended prior to its importation, and leaving the larger proportion of labour to be performed in Canada, it is considered should be admitted free, or at a duty not to exceed 2½ per cent.

2. Articles entering largely into consumption in this country, and which Canada cannot produce, such as Tea, Coffee, raw Sugar, Molasses, &c., should not be charged with a high rate of duty, but should be admitted free, or at the lowest possible rate consistent with the requirements of the Revenue.

3. Merchandize in the Dry Goods, Hardware and Crockery Trades, being articles of luxury or for use, and not likely for some time to be manufactured in this country, and of which some are used to form parts of the goods and wares manufactured in Canada, should be chargeable with a medium rate of duty of about 15 per cent, as at present, or not to exceed 20 per cent, but at the rate of about 10 per cent below what may be charged on articles coming directly into competition with our own manufactured products.

4. All manufactures in Wood, Iron, Tin, Brass, Copper, Leather, India Rubber, &c., competing with our industrial products, as more fully specified in the proposed list of articles and duties, now submitted and adopted, should be charged a duty of about 25 per cent, excepting:—

Books, Drawings, &c., which should be charged with a duty of 10 to 15 per cent.

Cottons and Woolens, Cordage, Lines, and Twines, with a duty of 20 per cent.

Clothing and Wearing Apparel, with a duty of 30 per cent.

That your memorialists, believing that the immediate effect of a revision of the tariff according to the scale now suggested, will be to mitigate the despondency perceptible in every quarter, to create a feeling of confidence in the minds of resident capitalists, to attract the attention of foreigners to our magnificent manufacturing resources, to stimulate enterprise among our mechanics and artizans, and import fresh vigour to our agricultural population.

That your memorialists in conclusion, respectfully pray that Your Hon House will be pleased to give prompt consideration to the whole subject, and adopt without delay such changes as may be found essential to the promotion of the great public interests that are involved, and as to your wisdom may seem meet.

And your Memorialists will ever pray.

Signed in behalf of the Meeting.

W. B. JARVIS, Chairman.

ISAAC BUCHANAN.

W. RODDEN.

THOS. BRUNSKILL.

W. WEIR,

Secretary. D. C. GUNN.

aff
fre
the
2nd

And
Ala
Boa
Boc
Boc
Boi
Cab
u
Cor
Cot
Con
C
Cop
Dea
Decl
Dra
Dres
Iron

3rd.

Acie
Bol
Bra
Bra
Cor
Ebo
Elep
Em
Gla
Gol
Hai
Iron
Iron
w
Iron
Leo
Lith
Mar

PROPOSED ALTERATIONS IN THE PRESENT TARIFF.

CLASSIFICATION OF ARTICLES FOR DUTY.

1st. All Goods, Wares and Merchandize not herein-after enumerated it is proposed should remain upon the free, $2\frac{1}{2}$, 5 or 15 per cent lists as at present arranged, in the tariff now in force.

2nd. LIST OF ARTICLES PROPOSED TO BE REMOVED FROM THE LISTS OF GOODS NOW ADMITTED FREE, AT $2\frac{1}{2}$ OR 5 PER CENT. DUTY.

Anchors under 8 cwt.	Machinery, all kinds,
Alabaster and other Busts,	Paper, all kinds,
Boat Hawsers,	Plough Moulds,
Books of all kinds,	Plaster Casts,
Book-Binders' Implements and Tools,	Printers' Ink, Implements, Types and
Boiler Plates, punched,	Lithograph Presses,
Cables of iron, or Chains made of iron	Roman Cement,
under $\frac{3}{4}$ in. diameter,	Ropes, Hawsers, and Rigging,
Cordage, lines and twines of all kinds,	Sheaves,
Cotton Wick,	Sails,
Connecting Rods, Frames and Pedestals,	Ship's Blocks,
Cranks and Straps for Engines,	Spikes,
Copy Books,	Telegraph Insulators,
Dead Eyes,	Trunks,
Deck Plugs,	Varnish,
Drawings, Engraving and Prints,	Veneers,
Dressed Furs,	Wheels and Axles,
Iron Wheels and Axles,	

3rd. LIST OF ARTICLES PROPOSED TO BE PLACED UPON THE FREE LIST, OR AT A DUTY NOT TO EXCEED $2\frac{1}{2}$ PER CENT.

Acids,	Mahogany in the log,
Bolting cloths,	Mercury or quick silver,
Braids for making bonnets and hats,	Mohair, unmanufactured,
Brass and Copper Tubes, drawn,	Moss for beds,
Cork tree or bark of, unmanufactured,	Ratans unmanufactured,
Ebony unmanufactured,	Shafts, wrought iron, 10 inches in diame-
Elephant's teeth, do., and Ivory	ter and over,
Emery,	Sea-weed and all other vegetable sub-
Glass broken,	stances, uses for beds & mattresses,
Gold beaters Brine-mould and Skins,	Seedlac
Hair, all kinds, unmanufactured,	Sal. Soda,
Iron wire,	Soap stocks and stuff,
Iron pipes or tubes for steam, gas, or	Stockenette,
water, not cast,	Tin, granulated or grain,
Iron unmanufactured,	Topancion or grass for brush-makers,
Leopard and other skins raw,	Willow for making baskets,
Lithrage,	Wire of all kinds,
Manilla grass,	Wire wove, if over 50 inches wide.

4th. LIST OF ARTICLES PROPOSED TO BE PLACED ON THE 25
PER CENT LIST OF DUTIES

Adzes,	Coaches,
Agricultural Machines,	Coal Hods,
Ale,	Cocks, Brass or other,
Anchors under 8 cwt,	Collars of Linen, Cotton or Paper,
Augers,	Combs,
Axes,	Comfits, Preserved,
Axeltrees and Boxes,	Confectionery,
Baskets,	Connecting Rods,
Belting of Leather or India Rubber,	Corn Breakers or Shellers,
Bedsteads of Wood or Iron,	Cooking Stoves and Apparatus,
Bed Screws,	Copper Work,
Beer,	Corks and manufactures of Cork,
Bellows,	Cranks, wrought or cast-Iron,
Bell Metal Manufactured,	Cut Nails, Tacks, Brads, and Sprigs,
Bells,	Dead-Eyes,
Bottles of Glass and Vials,	Deck Plugs,
Blacking,	Demijohns,
Blacksmiths', Hammers and Sledges,	Drawer-Nobs of Wood,
Blocks for Ships or Vessels,	Doors of Wood or Iron and Gates,
Boards planed or wrought,	Drawing Knives,
Boiler Plates Cut punched or turned	Dust Pans,
into shape for use,	Earthenware,
Boilers or parts thereof	Envelopes,
Bolts with or without nuts or washers,	Edge Tools,
Bonnets,	Engines, or parts thereof,
Boots and shoes,	Farming Utensils,
Blank Books all kinds,	Fanning Machines
Brass Couplings and joints of any metal	Filters,
Brackets and Pendants for Gas, of Tin,	Fire Engines,
Copper or Brass,	Flat or Smoothing Irons,
Bricks,	Forge Hammers,
Brushes, of all kinds,	Frames or Pedestals of Engines,
Brick Making Machines,	Furniture, Household, Wood or Iron,
Buck and Leather Mitts, Gloves, and	Furs and Skins when dressed,
Moccasins,	Fur, Manufactures of,
Cabinet Wares,	Furnaces,
Candles of every kind,	Gates,
Caps " "	Glass, Colored,
Carriages, and Carriage Springs,	Glass, silvered,
Carved work in any material,	Glue,
Casks, Empty,	Gauges,
Castings of Iron or Brass,	Gold Leaf,
Cement, Roman,	Gunpowder, all kinds,
Chairs,	Hair, Manufactured, or worked in any
Chandeliers,	way,
Chisels,	Hames of Wood,
Clothes Pins,	Harness, all kinds,
Clocks,	Hangers, wrought or cast iron,
	Hatchets,

Hats, Harmoniums, Harrows, Heating Appartus, Hay Knives and Presses, Hobby Horses, Hods, Hoes, Hinges, Handles, and Bolts of wrought or cast Iron, Handles of wood for Tools or Imple- ments. India-Rubber, Manufactures of, Ink of any kind, Iron Castings, Iron Plough Moulds or Shares, Iron Screws, Iron Vessels, Iron Weights, Jack Screws, Kettles, Iron Copper or Brass, Lead, Manufactures of, Leather, " " Looking-Glasses, framed or not, Locomotives, Locks of cast-Iron, Machinery of every description, Malleable Iron Castings Mallets of Wood, Mantle Pieces of Iron, Marble, Slate and Wood, Marble Manufactures, Manufactures of Wood, Mattresses, Mills for Bark or course Grain, Millinery, Mill Irons Wrought or Cast, Mill Saws, Mineral Water, Mops, Mouldings, Plain or Ornamented, Oil, when pressed, refined, or bleached, Organs, Patent Medicines, Pit Saws, Paper, Labels, Boxes, Music Ruled Printed, and Cards, Pianoforts, Pickles, Pitch Forks, for Hay and Manure, Pipes of Cast Iron, Clay, smoking Wood and Lead, Planes and Plane Irons of all kinds,	Ploughs, Porter, Prepared Rigging, Pumps, all kinds, Putty, Rakes, Iron, Steel, or Wood, Railing and Fencing of Iron, cast or wrought, Reaping Machines, Railway Chains, wrought or cast, Railway Cars of all kinds, Riddles or Seives of Wire, Rivets, Brass, Iron, or Copper, Refrigerators, Robes made up, Saddles and Bridles, Saddle Trees, Safes, all kinds, Saws, Mill, long and circular, cross cut, Pit and Billet, Scagliola Work, Scale Beams and Scales, Scythes, Sewing Machines, Ships' Blocks, Shafts, Cast Iron, Shafts, wrought-Iron under 10 in diamet'r Sails made up, Sheaves, Shirts, Shoes of all kinds, Shovels and Spades Seives of Wire, Sleighs, Soaps of all kinds, Socket Chissels. Spars, Spikes, Spokes, Springs, Steam or Sailing Vessels of any kind, Steam Guages or Whistles, Stones Wrought, Stoves and Heating Apparatus, Tables Wood or Iron, Thrashing Machines & Horse Powers. Traps, Steel, Iron, Wire or Wood, Trunks, Varnish all kinds, Valves of Brass and other metals, Waggon and Cart Boxes, Water Wheels of Iron, Washers.
---	--

Weighing Machines, Weights, Copper, Lead or Brass, Wheels and Axles for Locomotives and Cars.	Whips all kinds, Wooden Wares, Zinc Manufacture,
--	--

5th. LIST OF ARTICLES PROPOSED TO BE CHARGED AT THE FOLLOWING RATES.

10 to 15 PER CENT.	Woolen Manufactures all kinds, Cordage, Lines and Twines, Hawsers, Ropes and Rigging,
Books, Drawings, Engravings and Etchings, Lithographs, Music, Paintings and Prints,	30 PER CENT.
20 PER CENT.	Clothing and Wearing Apparel made up or partly made up, of any material.
Cotton Manufactures, all except Yarn and Warp.	

6th. Teas, Raw Sugars, Coffee, and Molasses, to be reduced to the lowest point the revenue will admit of.

7th. Other articles now paying specific duties, such as spirits, Cordials, Wines, Tobacco,* &c., &c., might remain as at present, or the duty thereon be increased if necessary.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE NAMED IN THE FOREGOING RESOLUTIONS:

At a Meeting of the General Committee held on the 15th April inst, the following gentleman were appointed an Executive Committee:—Isaac Buchanan, M.P.P.; W. Rodden, Montreal; John Shaw, Kingston; Murray Anderson, London; H. O. Burritt, Ottawa; Robert Hay, Toronto; W. B. Jarvis, Toronto; Thomas Brunskill, Toronto; George Sheppard, Toronto; John E. Pell, Toronto.

It was then moved by Mr. W. Rodden, seconded by Mr. Chas. Garth, and

Resolved, That in the absence of any representative from Quebec, it is out of the power of this Committee to name a gentleman of that city as one of the Executive

* It is recommended in view of the large importation of manufactured Tobacco, and the numerous class of persons in the country acquainted with this branch of industry, to raise the duties on this article with a view to encourage its home manufacture, and thereby furnish employment to a large class of coloured persons who at present find great difficulty in securing profitable and steady employment.

Committee, therefore the Secretary be authorized to add the name of a gentleman from that city to the Executive Committee, as soon as those interested in this movement shall meet and elect such a representative to act as one of the said Executive Committee.

Moved by Mr. Isaac Buchanan, M.P.P., seconded by Mr. J. L. Mathewson, of Montreal, and

Resolved, That this organization of the friends of Home Industry adopt the general name of the "*Association for the Promotion of Canadian Industry*," each member to pay in advance an annual subscription of five dollars.

Mr. W. B. Jarvis was unanimously elected President of the Association, and Mr. W. Weir was appointed Secretary.

A resolution was then adopted instructing the Secretary to issue a circular requesting every City, Town, and Village to organize a society to forward the objects of this Association, and that the Chairmen of such societies be *ex-officio* members of the Association, and that each local society be desired to contribute to the funds of the central committee to support the organization.

INTERVIEW WITH THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

On the 16th inst., a deputation from the Executive Committee waited by appointment on the Inspector General at the Council Office. The deputation consisted of the following members of the Executive Committee, I. Buchanan, M.P.P. ; W. B. Jarvis, W. Rodden, J. E. Pell and Thos. Brunskill, accompanied by the following gentlemen :—

Hon. Chas. Wilson, M.L.C.	W. Mattice, M.P.P.	C. Garth
D. A. McDonald, M.P.P.	John Cameron, M.P.P.	W. Weir
S. Bellingham, M.P.P.	J. H. Pope, M.P.P.	W. Parkyn
T. M. Daly, M.P.P.	John White, M.P.P.	T. F. Miller
J. M. Ferris, M.P.P.	J. G. Bowes	D. C. Gunn, &c. &c.
John Carling, M.P.P.	E. Atwater	
T. D. McGee, M.P.P.	J. L. Mathewson	

With the Inspector General were the Premier, and the Hon. Geo. E. Cartier.

Messrs Jarvis and Rodden having explained the ob-

ject of the interview, the Inspector General replied, that the Government was disposed to carry out the views of the deputation as far as consistent with the general interests of the country, and the requirements of the Revenue, and that measures would be submitted during the present session, which, if they did not meet their views in all cases, would, he believed, be generally satisfactory.

Several gentlemen present entered into explanations respecting the requirements of their particular branches of trade, and urged upon the Inspector General, and the other Members of the Government present, the necessity for immediate legislation on this important question. In answer to a question from Mr. McGee, whether the modifications in the tariff to be introduced were likely to meet the views of the gentlemen present, the Inspector General replied, that the tariff would certainly be adjusted with the view of so equalizing the duties, as to place all branches of trade on a more equal footing, and encouraging our home industry.

It is impossible in this place to enter upon a discussion of the measures recommended in this report—they will at once commend themselves to all who are disposed to give them due consideration. It is to be regretted that much misapprehension exists, and much misrepresentation is resorted to, to defeat the objects we have in view. The friends of the movement, it is hoped, will exert themselves in disseminating correct information in their respective neighbourhoods. We ask no increase of taxation, but a change in the mode of levying duties. We desire to admit Tea, Sugar and Coffee free, as we cannot produce them, and to increase the duty on articles competing with our own industry, thus encouraging the growth of manufactures amongst us, and thereby promoting the best interests of every class in the community.

W. WEIR, *Secretary.*

TORONTO, 24th April, 1858.

It is particularly requested that parties who have any suggestions to offer, communicate (*post paid*) with the Secretary.

ried, that
views of
general
s of the
d during
eet their
lly satis-

anations
branches
and the
necessity
uestion.
ther the
re likely
Inspec-
ainly be
duties,
footing,

scussion
ney will
posed to
ted that
present-
in view.
ill exert
in their
e of tax-
es. We
we can-
articles
ging the
by pro-
e com-

etary.

s to offer,